



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICS.

APRIL, 1892.

ECONOMIC REFORM SHORT OF SOCIALISM.

EVERY careful reader of socialist literature must be impressed with the extremely *a priori* character of most socialist theorizing. One of the over-bold assumptions of the socialist school is that socialism is the only possible result of democratic evolution. Very few sensible people, of whatever tendency, accredit the late Sir Henry Maine's prophecy, that society is to return to aristocracy or to monarchy. The civil polity of the future will doubtless be more and more completely a government by the many. One can also easily believe, with Adolph Wagner, that, as civilization advances, the state is sure to widen rather than narrow its function. But it is very rash to proclaim socialism as absolutely the only way whereby society can advance out of its *laissez-faire* ills.

Another pet affirmation of socialists, which always strikes the present writer as excessively dogmatic, is that society may look for entire surcease of its woe, for a virtual paradise of economic equity and bliss, as sure to come by and by. To believe this is to go beyond the secular evidence—evidence properly so called—and to exercise faith. All history is against such an expectation; nor have any measures been propounded by any sect of social reformers, even the socialists themselves, whose execution, supposing this possible, would yield aught beyond relative felicity. A larger hope than this

may be very pleasant, but it is the mark of zealots rather than of cool, scientific thinkers.

"Man's unhappiness, as I construe," is one of Carlyle's sayings, "comes of his greatness; it is because there is an Infinite in him, which with all his cunning he cannot quite bury under the Finite. Will the whole finance ministers and upholsterers and confectioners of modern Europe undertake, in joint-stock company, to make one shoeblack happy? They cannot accomplish it, above an hour or two; for the shoeblack also has a soul quite other than his stomach, and would require, if you consider it, for his permanent satisfaction and saturation, simply this allotment, no more and no less: *God's infinite universe altogether to himself*, therein to enjoy infinitely and fill every wish as fast as it rose. Oceans of Hochheimer, a throat like that of Ophiuchus: speak not of them; to the infinite shoeblack they are as nothing. No sooner is your ocean filled than he grumbles that it might have been of better vintage. Try him with half of a universe, of an Omnipotence, he sets to quarrelling with the proprietor of the other half, and declares himself the most maltreated of men. Always there is a black spot in our sunshine: it is even as I said, the *shadow of ourselves*." *

And is it not quite sure that such relative felicity as we may expect will not proceed from any one measure of policy? Many friends of man are in despair at this moment because, in analyzing one social remedy after another, they find no sufficing virtue in any by itself. But suppose we discover here a little and there a little, if we but search far, we shall have brought to view, not a millennium, probably, but sources of social amelioration plenty enough at least to lift us from pessimism. There are processes at work now, in conjunction with the system of free industry, and many of them growing out of this, which, taken together, are rich with hope.

Many of the social remedies that are so freely prescribed of course need to be examined with care. A most popular

* "Sartor Resartus," chap. ix.

cry, so soon as an evil comes to be felt as such, is legislation. But there are unnumbered evils, some of them very pressing, which cannot be cured by legislation. Not a few would be rendered much worse by any effort to treat them in this way. Already painful disrespect for law has been engendered by its use for purposes to which it is little adapted. Excellent in its place, and not to be avoided out of any doctrinaire scruples, legislation is not a panacea.

The restriction of immigration, much good as it might do for the time being, cannot be of permanent avail. All apart from those who come to us from abroad, our population swells with incredible speed. A better homogeneity in it would no doubt be of some advantage, as rendering education and the dissemination of right ideas easier. Yet, unless the strife of classes and the deep-lying causes therefor can be radically mollified, though not a foreigner be permitted to land, we shall find our trouble perpetually with us. The restrictive policy would have as little effect in England, where it is preached to-day almost as loudly as here. For England, state colonization would certainly for a long time be of great service. The Earl of Meath recommends it strongly, and it is the main thought of Mr. Rees's inspiring book, "*From Poverty to Plenty*," recently published.

We see, also, no promise in Tolstoi's proposal. Tolstoi, as is well known, disgusted with a half-dozen plans of social reform which he had devised and vainly sought to launch, determined entirely to reverse his old mode of life, and to place himself absolutely upon a level with the poorest. Social betterment, he thinks, will come only when people submit to the first law of nature, as he calls it,—every one working with his hands and living by the sweat of his own brow.

So far as this is a hearty protest against the wrongs which the poor endure, and against the vicious social customs and fashions which help to render their suffering necessary, it is well; but it would not be well in general, and it would be a painful misfortune for the poor in particular, were men of Tolstoi's ability to betake themselves to lives of unskilled labor. Others can do that better than they, and they can do

much else, quite as indispensable to the welfare of all, better than the poor.

With the Tolstoi plan may be mentioned "slumming," which is so fashionable at present. For well-bred and well-to-do young men who are to be clergymen, teachers, lawyers, merchants, or whatever else, to familiarize themselves with the slums of London, Paris, New York, and other great cities, and with the people who reside there, learning how they live, their discontent, the causes for it, how they view the great world, and the many other lessons which such a residence is calculated to teach, cannot but work considerable advantage. Were this custom to become truly general, the time would certainly arrive when active philanthropists would not be looked upon as cranks, and when more wisdom than now would be available for the execution of reforms among the poorest of the poor. Still, here, also, is no fundamental resource.

Infinitely less valuable is what many are still continually preaching, free charity. Charity is good. Of benevolence in heart and purpose we cannot have too much. But we can easily have too much of that easy-going charity in act and habit which was sedulously built up by centuries of bad religious teaching in the mediæval church. The evil of it is twofold: it squanders the wealth which might be supporting labor and swelling the general stock of weal in the earth, and it breeds shiftlessness, breaking down industrial and moral character. Witness the operation of England's old Poor Law, and the history of poor relief in the great cities of our own country. No modern city can boast, like early Athens, of having no citizen in want, or of freedom from the disgrace of begging. America is far freer of this curse than Europe, yet it is here too, and becoming so oppressive in most of our cities that it is past understanding how sensible people continue to give way to their sympathetic impulses when alms are demanded.

Mr. C. W. Smiley, in the *Popular Science Monthly* for November, 1888, tells of a boy, in the city of Washington, who, put up to it by his mother, herself in not at all needy circumstances, began increasing his profits as a paper-seller by hob-

bling about on a crutch. Congressmen and others would pass him a quarter, sometimes more, for the morning paper, refusing change. At last it became clear that his crutch was more profitable than his trade, whereupon he sunk from the honorable calling into that of a mere beggar. Mr. Smiley prosecuted this lad in the police court, and succeeded, after considerable effort, in putting an end to his fraudulent gains; but until the cheat was clear, popular opinion was decidedly in favor of the boy as against the prosecutor. A hundred cases could be recited showing, like this, the danger to character from indiscriminate alms.

On the other hand, one of the most splendid reforms of our day is that of organized charity, which is accomplishing so noble a work in very many of our cities. It operates to minimize the evils just described, preventing the waste of charity funds, and making the too free recipients of these ashamed and willing to work instead. The immediate saving is as nothing compared with the character-building which accompanies this wise form of philanthropy. The people engaged therein have opened a distinct new source of general economic welfare. No longer can old-school economists denounce the spirit of philanthropy as antagonistic to the wealth-multiplying impulse, since here we behold philanthropy pure and simple, the freest possible from all taint of self-seeking, doing a work demonstrably and in an extraordinary degree advantageous to the amassing of wealth.

All rejoice in the movement, so popular among work-people, for shorter work-hours. Yet it raises a question with two sides. Shorter hours would certainly advantage the workman in the first instance, but the final welfare of working-people must depend on industrial prosperity at large. Now, in our age, so overwhelming a majority of the work of production is accomplished by capital in the form of machinery, that any policy looking to an increase of work-less hours must reckon with the waste arising from idle capital.

There is certainly at some point a golden mean where the higher efficiency of labor through shortened tasks will just balance this loss. What that is—whether eight hours, or ten,

or six—we are not yet in a condition to decide, probable as it is that an eight-hour or even a six-hour day may finally prove best.

One argument against shorter hours is almost too contemptible to be named. It is that the laborers will misuse their leisure. A few may do so, but the majority will not. They will profit by it to the cultivation of their best manhood. It is good to know that many establishments are voluntarily introducing the eight-hour system, and find it to work well in every way.

George Gunton has advanced a paradoxical theory, to the effect that the general payment of present wages for shorter hours, or of higher for present hours, would not only advantage laborers, but actually force up the aggregate national wealth, profits and dividends rising with wages. His thought, allied to Rodbertus', is that, wage-earners being the chief consumers, increase in their ability to buy must immensely stimulate demand, to be met only by improved machinery, which, appearing, would cheapen production. The gain, it is argued, would thus perpetuate itself.

The reasoning is specious, but doctrinaire and inconclusive. No doubt, were such a thing possible, a firm, universal strike for somewhat higher wages would succeed. The wages-fund is more or less elastic, and capitalists would prefer smaller returns to none at all. Labor might thus win in the first instance. Permanent betterment, however, would require the new pressure on capital to be so adroitly tempered as to keep up the new economy, on the one hand, without, on the other, discouraging production. The same analysis would fit a voluntary addition to wages by employers. There can be no assurance of permanent rise in wages save through more copious production. Gunton, to be sure, expects just this in consequence of better machinery. But that is something which cannot be had on simple notification.

One of the most hopeful signs of our times is the increasing willingness of employers and employés to submit their difficulties to arbitration. We see the result of this in the recession of the "strike" wave which reached its height in

1886. During the year 1888 only 211,000 employés were involved in strikes or lock-outs, against 345,000 the year before, and 448,000 the year before that. Sympathetic strikes have also fallen off, the number engaged in these in 1888 being but eight per cent. of the total number, against thirteen per cent. in 1887. The inference is that laborers are learning not to resort to the strike except in cases of genuine grievance. We consequently find that while in 1886 but twenty per cent. of the strikes completely succeeded, the next year the percentage rose to thirty-eight, and in 1888 to fifty. Later statistics are not at hand, but would probably re-enforce these inferences.

Co-operation, of which profit-sharing is one form, is to increase its scope. The writer does not expect, as some do, that it will become the main mode of production; but nothing hinders such a growth of it as greatly to alleviate the workingman's condition. Co-operative establishments endure crises better than others, which must do much, in time, to lessen the intensity of crises. Besides, there is prospect that co-operative wages, being taken, as they naturally will be, for standards in arbitration, will gradually have the effect of elevating all wages.

According to the new theory of wages and profits now usually taught by economists, the proportion of product passing into the form of profits is continually falling, that going to wages increasing. This principle, suppose it true,—it is not yet certainly so,—does not, by itself, mean that individual wages must necessarily rise, because increase of population may prevent this, however large the proportion of product ever destined to go as wages. But a force is inevitably operating, through the competition of employers, to insure that in no long time all competitive profits will be as low as they ought to be; in other words, that all such profits received will be profits *earned*. It is not rash to believe that in this way society is destined to get its economic oversight and planning—the work for which profits are given—done at length far cheaper and better than would be the case under socialism of any form.

Our lot is cast in a very peculiar age. Never again, prob-

ably, so long as the world stands, will men pass through a century so abnormal as the present, in the possibility of winning extraordinary gains. Humanity is henceforth, in the main, to settle down to regular and permanent modes of getting its living. The world's best land has been taken up: It is hardly possible that labor-saving inventions, embodied and unembodied, should come into existence so rapidly for any similar period hereafter as they have since the beginning of the century whose last years are now passing. Going to sleep poor to awake a millionaire; great fortunes by the turn of a hand; revelling in wealth without contributing aught to the production of wealth,—these things must be henceforth less and less common as the decades roll by.

As capital is multiplied, interest will go down, so that idle wealth will be the possible possession of fewer and fewer persons, while not even the richest will be able whimsically to withhold capital from producing. When we learn, too, as we shall, to tax property highly in proportion as it is in no sense socially productive, useless riches may easily become quite as rare as they could be in a society organized in the socialist's manner.

Nothing but removable ignorance and apathy prevents the practical abolition of those fluctuations in money value which are now so grievously influential. The writer has, in another place,* set forth with some particularity how such monetary reform might be carried out. While the labor problem fills the public mind as at this moment, little attention can be expected to a matter so recondite and difficult as that of reform in the world's system of hard money. But the necessary study will come, followed by the required improvement, and the injustice which rich and poor have been suffering from this source since the beginning of history, almost, will pass away.

As to the wasteful clashing of interests in the great businesses, the yearly demand for any line of goods can be statistically forecast by public authority just as well now as under

* "An Honest Dollar," in Publications of American Economic Association.

socialism; while the other part of the problem, determining how much product each mill shall put out every year, is in the way to be beautifully solved, entirely without cost to the state, by the system of trusts. Many trusts are abominable and dangerous, and will have to be regulated or crushed; but this co-ordinating part of their work is wholly excellent, though usually ignored. They should have the credit of it.

Indescribably benign and far-reaching reforms are to be wrought out in our slipshod and unjust methods of taxation,—taxation, that mighty enginery, usually so baneful hitherto, yet now offering itself as a benign means of distributing inordinate winnings gotten through rent or other monopoly. We shall speedily, I hope, revise our revenue system, now so distressingly burdensome to the country's industries as a whole, the most so to many which are supposed to be specially aided by it. We shall give up the vain effort to tax personality, and rate more heavily the tangible and visible forms of property which no one can hide. The public power will get more and more out of the lucrative franchises and monopolies of its own creation, easing the great mass of us who toil without any aid from such special advantages. In cities we shall one day raise the entire tax from ground-rents and from these lucrative franchises.

Henry George is a sincere friend of humanity. He is also clear-headed, and many of the economic analyses in his books are very brilliant. Further, while the writer cannot at all accept the fundamental principles of George's philosophy, yet he is bound to express on two weighty points entire concurrence with that author. One is that the private ownership of land, which most of us, unlike George, do not see how we can after all set aside, at present involves distressing evils and injustice. The other is that the taxation of land proper is one of the fairest possible forms of raising revenue as well as one of the easiest and most convenient to administer.

We are far from thinking that all Mr. George's reasons for resorting to this species of taxation are sound. Nor can we believe that two-thirds or one-half of the good which he expects from its adoption will be realized. But we are convinced

that to place a heavy, if not the main, tax on land, apart from improvements, is not only just and equitable, but extraordinarily politic: that it would increase the production of wealth, decrease the holding of land for purely speculative ends, and in many ways aid to better relations between the social classes.

Many of the objections raised against the George philosophy are in a way recommendations instead. Among these is that of William T. Harris, who has figured, as he thinks, that a land tax alone, though it were to extend to the entire confiscation of rent, would not be sufficient to defray public expenses. Were that so, a chief difficulty in George's scheme, as propounded by him,—the proposal, namely, to bestow rich largesses upon the unfortunate,—would be removed. But a stiff tax might be laid upon land without entirely destroying private income from rent, and involving no whit more confiscation than the forms of taxation now prevalent; in fact, much less.

One may easily be optimist enough to expect that, as knowledge of economic laws becomes general and as altruism deepens its hold upon the human heart, the needless expenditures of the rich as well as those of the poor will be given up. Mark what is said: *needless* applications of wealth, expenditures prompted solely by lust and vanity, doing good to no one whatever in any way whatever, but evil, pure evil, to all.

Riches are used inexcusably in certain other cases,—those, namely, in which the purchase is not worthless or vicious, but costly out of all proportion to the good it will ever do. Instance the thousands of dollars' worth of Raphael's paintings in the Torlonia palace at Rome, for months at a time visible to no one, and accessible to the public perhaps once in five years. In many a moderately rich man's house the mere furniture and plate cost fifty thousand dollars, sixty thousand dollars, or even one hundred thousand dollars. This should be different, not through legislation so much, which could healthily get at the evil, if at all, only in an indirect manner, but through the enlightenment of consciences.

That the poor, too, squander their substance is no excuse

for the rich. The latter have had the better advantages, and ought, with firmer self-control, to set their less fortunate fellows a healthful example. Nor let any one make the mistake of supposing such waste justified by the fact that the mere processes by which the waste is brought about involve the employment of labor. Productive investment would equally have done this, and would then, beginning at the point where the actual outlay withdrew forever its sustenance to labor, have gone on in an endless career of furnishing such sustenance. New wealth would have resulted, bringing sharper competition of capital with capital, lowering the rate of interest, and making much industry possible which, owing to the loss, is now impossible. Waste, lavish spending, sowing money broadcast, are not of service to labor: they curse it instead.

Taxes will soon be laid on legacies, heavy in proportion to their unproductiveness. He who considers that all wealth is in a way a social product, and considers, too, that all abstraction of wealth from production has the positive and direct effect of increasing poverty and making all economic conditions harder for the multitude, will quickly conclude that a wealthy man has no moral right to turn capital into forms of truly idle wealth, or forms of wealth out of which only the owner himself, or an extremely limited circle of human beings, can derive good.

There will further be introduced a means of public saving which must greatly alleviate the burden of taxation,—the saving, namely, of that vast bulk of unearned increment which our present loose policy lets go to individuals. We might, without confiscation or injustice of any kind, inhibit all public persons from ever hereafter selling outright a single foot of land. Rise in land values would then become a source of public wealth instead of private, and one from which no possible danger could arise. I am of opinion that no man living has sounded in his thought the new weal which awaits human society from these small but obvious improvements in taxation.

There are also to come new measures of administration,

which cannot but be almost equally helpful. There is not an evil of a temporal nature which society now suffers that does not either originate in poor administration or derive more or less aggravation therefrom. Civil Service reform is a prime necessity, and its success is well-nigh as important economically as politically. Many another imperative reform waits for prosperous beginning upon this. Our banking methods, though much improved since the war, are imperfect, causing losses indefinitely large. The same of insurance. Better surveillance over both these departments must be had. A huckstering life insurance business is carried on among the poor by a base lot of sharpers, the results of which are pauperism and the increase of poverty. I have never known attention to be called to this great evil. Abuses even greater in magnitude exist in the matter of marine insurance, which offers peculiar temptations to fraud, and facilities therefor, as pointed out by Samuel Plimsoll in the *Nineteenth Century* for March, 1889. Twelve thousand sterling per annum, he thinks, are thus wasted at sea.

Intemperance is a dreadful economic woe. It has been computed that this country consumes nine hundred and ninety-four million dollars worth of intoxicating liquors annually,—money enough to pay for and keep up a ten-thousand-dollar life insurance policy for every head of a family in the land, thus practically abolishing poverty. There is hope that this dreadful inroad upon our material prosperity may in time cease to be made. Whether by high license, or by prohibition, or by licensing weak liquors and prohibiting strong, and at last prohibiting the public sale of all, we shall go far in time towards eradicating the liquor appetite as well as the liquor habit.

In Europe more than here suffering arises through another terrible curse,—viz., military expenses. It is computed that Europe's annual outgo in this direction is not less than a billion and three-fourths of dollars. This sum takes no account of the loss in productive labor occasioned by the withdrawal therefrom of the flower of the male population. Were this item to be added, the yearly expense would be

considerably in excess of two billions. Unfortunately, the outlook for change in this particular is not satisfactory. Yet one can hardly believe that a system so infinitely wasteful and weakening will always continue. Self-interest alone must, it would seem, lead rulers to cultivate peaceful relations, and with the prevalence of international arbitration we may safely prophesy, if not universal disarming, yet a vast and beneficial reduction in military outgoes.

A great deal may be expected from increase of thrift in the poor. The waste of which they are at present guilty is incalculable. Could we prevent that which occurs in uneconomic housekeeping alone, a fund would result far more than enough to feed all the hungry. Mr. Atkinson, who has well urged this consideration, computes that a saving in comfort and force, from the food which each person in the United States consumes, of five cents' worth a day more than at present, would be the equivalent of a thousand millions of dollars a year. How much is lost through unintentional waste in ill choice of dress, food, modes of cooking and of tillage, and in the neglect of accounts and of little sums! These shiftless habits are very hard to reach, and will succumb to nothing but careful education. Therefore, in addition to the compulsory technical, industrial, agricultural, and physical training so wisely and warmly recommended by the Earl of Meath and others, let us speak up for positive and systematic instruction in thrift, as a necessity in all primary and secondary schools. The school savings-banks which have been introduced in many cities of our country deserve to be extended to all the public schools of the land. Instruction in economics is already considerably general, and rapidly becoming more so. Its primary intention is not, of course, to cultivate economy, but it will incidentally have this effect.

Striking are the figures which connect general thriftlessness and petty criminality with ignorance. The latest judicial statistics for England and Wales show that in the years 1886-87, twenty-seven and five-tenths per cent. of the people committed for crime could neither read nor write. Seventy per cent. could only read and write imperfectly, only two and

eight-tenths per cent. well, and only one in a thousand was really educated. Ignorance and poverty are mutually cause and effect. Among the above, ten and five-tenths per cent. were of no occupation; laborers, needle-women, and the like formed fifty-two per cent.; factory hands six per cent.; skilled mechanics fourteen and one-half per cent. Of people in the professional employments only two in a thousand were represented.

Even the big corporation and the trust will not prove beyond society's reach. As we have seen, there is a good side to the trust. To the system of trusts, as to the general system of massed capital, there is confessedly a dangerous side. The danger is partly political, from the control of governmental action; and partly economic, that of inordinate income at the public expense. In respect to this latter,—the economic peril,—notice, what is commonly overlooked, that a great organization of this sort is not necessarily a leech simply because its profits are immense. There is always this happy check upon one of these Titan agencies, that unless competition is intrinsically impossible, if prices are too high competing concerns spring to life; and the more it improves its methods in order to produce cheaply the greater the danger, since the cheaper methods cannot be long concealed. Unless the power concerned is vast enough, either singly or in combination with others, to control a majority of the line of product, it cannot permanently rob. The socialist will say, I know, that even so, society loses by allowing colossal returns to go into private hands which might help to enrich the whole body of us. The reply is that, if socialistically administered, these businesses would not yield these colossal returns.

But an agency may possess monopoly power, and yet, under public regulation, or in fear of annihilation, not use it to our harm. For this reason the writer cannot concur in the dictum that "Government may be rightly asked to undertake those services for the efficient or economical performance of which a monopoly is either desirable or necessary."* The

* Osborne Howes, Jr., *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. ii. p. 354.

great trusts-industries, for instance, come under this rule ; but they should not be assumed by "all of us" till every resource for the regulation of them has been tried in vain.

There remain, then, the incorrigible corporation or trust having and abusing a monopoly, and the incorrigible corporation or trust which is a troubler politically. All such can be, must be, will be placed under state surveillance, and, if necessary, under state ownership. Deep meaning is in the words of Paul, "The powers that be are ordained of God." Let us not use these powers wantonly, but where their action is truly necessary it will be found to be safe and benign. The present drift towards corporate action as against abstract individualism is at heart rational, and can hardly become morbid save by proceeding too fast. As the world ripens for it, as our Civil Service becomes purer, and as men come to look upon public office not merely in the light of a charge to keep, but as a heaven-sent opportunity to do good and bless their fellows, all refractory monopolies, and very likely a large number of others, will pass into public hands.

The services of all businesses so assumed will then be furnished to the public at cost, or, if above cost, will by so much lessen the taxes. And, with a Civil Service such as we must strive for, the cost of administering such works will be indefinitely less than now. For, even were conscience in no degree to take the place of greed as a motive to sharp surveillance, public management would still have great advantage, avoiding waste from useless competition, from cheating in the work of corporations, from gambling with stocks and bonds, from the impoverishment of stockholders, and from the double carriage of freight, while the tendency of public ownership would be so to place and operate railways, telegraphs, and other public plants as best to develop the country. In comparisons between public and private management of railways and telegraphs, items like these are nearly always overlooked.

This review has given the reader painfully little vision. It has shed upon society's future but a glimmer of light,—perhaps only that of Milton's hell, just enough to enable us to see

the darkness. But let us not despair. Till yesterday no study worthy the name was ever devoted to Social Science. What if the best minds of another century—the Darwins, the Huxleys, the Tyndalls, the Faradays, the Helmholtzes, the Siemenses—shall give themselves up to Social Science as those of the last have to physical? In such an event, of which there is no small probability, great progress cannot but come.

However, it will be noticed that very much of the advantage for the advent of which hope has been expressed, presupposes moral betterment in men. This is the sole ultimate resort. With the best insight which the writer can gain into the terrible social imbroglio of our age, he is able to foresee no truly tolerable—to say nothing of a satisfying or final—social state, save as men are led, much more than they now do, to love and work righteousness. Make men good, and you may even launch a system of socialism with some success. Make men good, and you will need no such system. Make men good, and with the helpful influences which we have traced, a very high pitch of rationality in living will be attained.

But how are men to be made good? There's the rub, the stubborn centre of the whole difficulty. Save by a miracle, the task will prove impossible unless we can somehow *purify the sources of population*. With any given set of individuals moral reform, if earnestly undertaken, nearly always succeeds. Promising effort of this kind is continually going on. But while we are successfully at work lifting one layer of human life, another is forming beneath, thicker, wider, and less tractable than the first. The worst members of society are commonly the most prolific. We can see that this is naturally so, because such people feel no responsibility for their offspring or for their kind. But is this order of things inevitable? Must it be permanent? So delicate a subject one would hesitate to discuss, even if one had a prescription. Plato is the only sociologist who has yet duly envisaged this awful problem, and whoso will may read, in the "Republic," how the grand Greek seer proposed to deal with it.

E. BENJ. ANDREWS.